DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 213 CS 210 474

AUTHOR Riffe, Daniel; And Others
TITLE "Clones," Codes, and Conflicts of Interest in Cartooning: Cartoonists and Editors Look at Ethics.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cartoons; *Codes of Ethics; Comparative Analysis; *Conflict of Interest; Conflict Resolution; Creative Expression; Decision Making; Editorials; Editors; Journalism; Mass Media Effects; Media Research; *Newspapers; Popular Culture; Role Conflict
IDENTIFIERS *Editorial Policy; *Political Cartoons

ABSTRACT

A study examined differences between political cartoonists and op-ed page editors on both traditional ethical issues (such as conflicts of interest) and the special, style-related concerns of editorial cartoonists. Hypotheses proposed were that editors and cartoonists (1) would condemn "cloning" or copying, reflecting an ethical principle transcending journalism or art; (2) would disagree on ethical concerns such as conflicts of interest, "freebies," or affording preferred status to prominent advertisers; and (3) would disagree on who should make publication decisions when ethical questions arise. Subjects, 117 editorial cartoonists and 93 editorial page editors, responded to a mailed questionnaire on editorial policy and demographics. Findings showed a measure of support for all three hypotheses. Both sample groups condemned "cloning" of styles or stealing of ideas, with artists more concerned about idea integrity than were editors. The two groups disagreed on the influence of superiors' pressure on such practice. Second, the groups disagreed on responses to several potential conflicts of interest, with editors seemingly advocating for cartoonists the noninvolvement ethic that guides journalists. Third, the samples disagreed on decision making, with cartoonists endorsing joint decision making when ethical questions arise, and editors preferring editor autonomy. Results suggest that at least some of the cartoonists' responses to particular items may be due more to some type of underlying principle unique to cartoonists than to the influence of such factors in ethical socialization as age and religion. However, several item responses were related to demographic traits that cut across the editor-cartoonist distinction. (Tables of data are included.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED282213

VISUAL COMMUNICATION DIVISION

"Clones," Codes, and Conflicts of Interest in Cartooning:

Cartoonists and Editors Look at Ethics

by

Daniel Riffe

Donald Sneed

Roger L. Van Ommeren

Presented to the Annual Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Antonio, August 1987. Riffe is associate professor of journalism at Alabama, Sneed is associate professor of journalism at San Diego State, and Van Ommeren is professor of journalism at South Dakota State.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Daniel Riffe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 210 474

"Clones," Codes, and Conflicts of Interest in Cartooning:
Cartoonists and Editors Look at Ethics

For years, many of journalists' ethical principles (e.g., disaffiliation or refusing privilege to preclude conflicts of interest) were regarded merely as conventions consistent with the institutional, adversary role of the press. Recent discussion of ethics, however, has become more comprehensive, treating journalists' individual moral development and beliefs,[1] and the importance of ethics to journalism's professionalization.[2]

Concomitant with increased concern with ethics[3] has been what Merrill calls "proliferating" codification of guidelines[4] over the last 10-15 years, as news organizations and professional associations have drawn up or revised codes of ethics.[5] But despite the flurry of activity and attention, not all editorial staffers are covered by the codes. Editorial or political cartoonists are such a group; professional cartoonist associations exist, but lack formal ethics codes.

This study surveys cartoonists' beliefs on issues of journalism ethics and, because disagreement on these matters could impact workplace harmony, contrasts them with editorial page editors' beliefs. Analyses then explore whether these beliefs might reflect basic principles held by the cartoonists, or might instead be related to demographic variables[6] such as age, experience, or religious or political identification.

Earlier studies found that cartoonists and editors have incongruent views of the cartoonist's purpose or function, and disagree on job autonomy factors or decision-making arrangements, on what makes "good" cartoons, on social and political issues, and on "limits of taste" or appropriateness in editorial cartooning.[7]

Would there be similar disagreement on ethical questions? Consider for a moment the argument that journalists have only limited opportunity to

draw from a limited repertoire of ethical principles, because of professionalism. Journalists' "moral prerogatives are preempted by how they work, how they are trained and educated, how they perceive their very identity as professionals"; professional norms deny the reporter the opportunity "to make ethical choices."[8] (E.g., beating the competition is an end that precludes concern over the means employed.)

Not everyone is willing to accept fully the argument that such a dysfunction exists, or that socialization into the journalism profession is such an effective reeducation process that it effectively diminishes or dominates one's pre-professional repertoire of ethical principles.

Nonetheless, the editorial artist is undoubtedly less encumbered by the constraints of news professionalism and might view ethical issues differently than staff counterparts, including editors, more socialized in the ways of the (news) profession.

In fact, while the demographic factors (e.g., age, experience, religious or family upbringing) identified by Endres[9] and Gray and Wilhoit[10] as influencing journalists' ethical development would apply also to the cartoonist's repertoire, two others (i.e., discussing ethical problems "with persons performing the same kind of work as themselves," and observation and role modeling of those persons' ethical behavior)[11] would likely be inoperative "social forces" for the lone editorial cartoonist one finds working in comparative isolation.

The artists are spared many ethical dilemmas (story fabrication, reliance upon unnamed sources, etc.) reporters face, and which receive critical attention. However, cartoonists face another ethical problem that sets them apart from their printed-word counterparts: the copying of styles or ideas.

Writers, admittedly, must deal with plagiarism, and major ethics codes

condemn it, but demonstrating story authorship is easier than establishing rights to the exaggerated feature or caricature, or to a stylized treatment of an issue addressed simultaneously by 200+ other editorial cartoonists.

While outright copying is rare, "there is a lot of imitation-is-the-sincerest-form-of-flattery," or "cloning"[12] (with successful, prominent cartoonists the most likely victims), though imitators would prefer the practice be called "emulation of style" or "adaptation of ideas."

This study examined cartoonist-editorial page editor differences on both traditional ethical issues (e.g., conflicts of interest), and this special, style-related concern of editorial cartoonists.[13] Based on the foregoing discussion, we anticipated that:

1. Editors and cartoonists both would condemn "cloning" or copying, reflecting an ethical principle transcending journalism or art.

2. Editors and cartoonists would disagree on ethical concerns such as conflicts of interest, "freebies," or affording preferred, privileged status to prominent advertisers. Here, the professional socialization of editors as journalists would be most pronounced, with editors more likely to reflect the news profession's traditional, absolutist view that newspeople must avoid even appearances of potential conflicts of interest.

3. Editors and cartoonists would disagree on who should make publication decisions when ethical questions arise. Previous research has shown artist-editor disagreement on decision making, with editors endorsing their own decision-making autonomy.

Method

In late 1985, mail questionnaires were completed by 117 (65%) of 180 editorial cartoonists, primarily those identified in Editor & Publisher Yearbook.[14] Questionnaires were completed by 93 (55%) of the cartoonists' 170 editorial page editors (several papers claim multiple cartoonists, and

several cartoonists work entirely through syndicates).

Five-point Likert-type, "Strongly Agree"/"Strongly Disagree" items measured the samples' agreement with statements on ethical issues, decision making, and sanctions. Demographic information was also obtained.

Findings and Discussion

The cartoonist sample is similar (e.g., age, political party identification) to earlier samples profiled by Best[15] and Riffe, et al.[16] The present cartoonist and editor samples are also similar, with no significant between-sample differences in percentages claiming particular political party or religious identification.[17] The cartoonists are significantly younger (by the Z-test, $p<.05$) than editorial page editors (mean ages 43.1 and 49 years, respectively), with nearly half under 40 years of age and only 22% of editors in that age category. On the other hand, the cartoonists averaged significantly ($p<.05$) more years experience cartooning (13.7 years) than editors did editing the editorial page (9.4 years). Cartooning may be one's occupation for life, but editing the editorial page usually follows years of reporting and editing work.

Table One compares cartoonist and editor responses, with items grouped by focus. Percentages agreeing and mean agreement scores are provided (the latter are used in F-test comparisons for between-sample differences).

As anticipated, a majority in both samples opposed copying of others' styles or ideas, with cartoonists significantly more vehement in condemning use of others' ideas.[18] The samples differed significantly in assigning blame for loss of cartoonist originality, with cartoonists more critical of employers. Editors were particularly opposed to the idea that editors "drive cartoonists to copy" others' styles, but nearly half agreed that cartoonists were "sometimes hired because their style resembles" a "successful cartoonist's." Still, the samples differed significantly, as eight

of ten cartoonists agreed that emulating another's style could pay off.

Our second anticipation--between-sample differences on traditional ethical issues--was supported on five of seven items. Editors, reflecting the disaffiliation or disengagement norm, differed significantly from artists in disapproving the cartoonist's attending corporate-sponsored professional conventions; accepting freebies; doing freelance work; or belonging to advocacy groups. Editors were also more likely (84% agreed vs. only 46% of cartoonists) to endorse disengagement in event of a cartoonist's "personal conflict" with news figures.

Cartoonist responses might be interpreted several ways. Some cartoonists simply may not recognize these as conflicts of interest. Or, cartoonists may be confident they can handle whatever a situation brings.

Editors, on the other hand, fear even an appearance of possible conflict of interest.

In short, these responses index differences in the two samples' professional ethical socialization, with cartoonists comparatively less socialized in "the rules of the game." (Emphasis on "comparatively" is deliberate; after all, on "conventions" and "freebies," the cartoonists also disapproved, albeit significantly less than did editors.)

But while cartoonists were significantly less likely to endorse separation of work and "personal conflicts" with news figures, the two samples agreed that newspaper advertisers are "fair game" for the cartoonist.

Both samples endorsed the idea that editorial cartooning should be more than venom and vitriol, and should function to "help solve problems of society." And while this endorsement of cartoonist social responsiveness suggests approval of cartoonist advocacy, recall that editors rejected the idea of cartoonists belonging to special interest or advocacy groups.

Perhaps this difference between principles of the cartoonists and

professional journalists is clearest in the item on cartoonists' political neutrality. Six of ten editors and 71% of cartoonists agreed that political party membership sometimes influences a cartoonist's cartoon treatment of opposing parties. Recall the cartoonists' endorsement of membership in special interest groups. Presumably, such membership would also affect editorial cartoon content.

It is precisely this sort of motivation that drove the first political cartoonists to take up pen and ink.[19]

As one cartoonist wrote, he is no "empyrean observer with Aristotelian calm who chooses, after suitable contemplation, to hurl a wisecrack at the world. I'm down there getting dirty in the issues and giving the things I don't like the benefit of my cyanide lip."[20] One might, in fact, wonder at these editors' condemning cartoonist commitment to causes, issues, etc. Arguably, it is the artist's commitment that makes a cartoon "work." And traditionally, historically, it has been commitment and concern that make cartoonists work.[21]

But however talented and politically involved the cartoonist, cartoons must, in most cases, be fair or tame enough to gain editor approval. And as we anticipated, the samples disagreed significantly on who should make publication decisions when ethical questions arise.

The cartoonists disagreed that either cartoonist or editor alone should make the decision, and 90% endorsed joint decision-making. But editors preferred less of a decision-making role (either alone or with the editors) for their counterparts. There was significantly less agreement by editors that joint decision making was optimal (79% agreed), and nearly two-thirds agreed that they alone should make publication decisions.

Preference among editors for editor autonomy is, of course, hardly surprising. The absence of a parallel preference among cartoonists, how-

ever, is surprising. Only 22% of the cartoonists endorsed cartoonist autonomy in such decisions.

But while there was clear disagreement on within-organization decisions about "what's ethical," both samples were equally uncertain of the value of either an external "cartoon council" to review published cartoons or a formal code of cartoon ethics, and whether cartoonists would accept such a code. Codes introduced for discussion at past cartoonist conventions have gone nowhere.[22]

But given the absence of a code, how should a newspaper sanction a cartoonist who violates the paper's ethical standards? Neither sample preferred either of two rather Draconian alternatives, dismissal or suspension, although nearly a third of each sample endorsed suspension.

In practice, of course, most cartoonists have little in-print opportunity to violate a paper's standards, simply because publication decision making rests with the editor (as even syndicated cartoonists have discovered). A cartoon which would violate clearly a paper's legal, ethical or taste standards is not published, and the artist is sent, literally, "back to the drawing board."

All three of our expectations, then, gained a measure of support. Both samples condemned "cloning" of styles or stealing of ideas, with artists more concerned about idea integrity. The samples disagreed on the influence of superiors' pressure on such practice.

Second, the samples disagreed on responses to several potential conflicts of interest, with editors seemingly advocating for cartoonists the non-involvement ethic that guides journalists.

Third, the samples disagreed on decision making, with cartoonists endorsing joint decision making when ethical questions arise, and editors preferring editor autonomy.

The analysis thus far has focused on between-sample differences. But are all cartoonists or all editors alike in their views on these issues? Are the samples' responses homogeneous enough to suggest commonly held principles underlying the responses? Several available demographic variables (age, years experience, political party and religious identifications) were introduced to the analysis, in order to examine within-sample homogeneity.

Table Two details the eight items on which, first, within-sample demographic subgroups differed significantly (e.g., Protestant cartoonists vs. Catholic cartoonists), and then offers comparison of those sub-groups across samples (e.g., Protestant cartoonists vs. Protestant editors).[23]

Among cartoonists, religion was related to belief in need for an ethics code, while political affiliation was related to view on attending corporate-sponsored conventions, on not criticizing advertisers, and on the need to address in cartoons the serious problems facing society. Age and years experience (highly correlated among cartoonists) were related to view on attending conventions, on participation in advocacy groups, on need to address serious problems, and on preference for having the editor make ethical decisions.

Among editors, religion was related to agreement that similarity of cartoon style to another's could influence hiring, while political identification was related only to belief that cartoonists would endorse a professional code of ethics. Editor age was related to agreement that corporate-sponsored conventions should be off-limits for cartoonists, and that cartoonists should address serious social problems. (An editor's years experience "as editor of the editorial page" was not as highly correlated with age as cartooning experience for cartoonists.)

In sum then, youth and political party "Independence," whether in

cartoonist or editor, tended toward a less traditional, less orthodox, less absolute response, in terms of advocacy groups, social problems and attending conventions, and letting the editor make decisions.

But although these individual subgroup contrasts are illuminating, perhaps more provocative is the fact that for most items, each sample's response was homogeneous across demographic sub-groups. That is, on 13 of the items, each sample--regardless of internal heterogeneity in age, years experience, religion or political identification--responded with "one voice," as if guided by a single, common principle. On only eight items did responses show an influence of that demographic heterogeneity.

Conclusions

Of course, failure by a handful of available demographic variables to locate significant differences among cartoonists on a non-exhaustive list of journalism ethical questions does not confirm the existence of an inviolate ethic within the cartooning profession. What it does suggest, however, is that at least some of the cartoonists' responses to particular items may be due more to some type of underlying principle unique to cartoonists than to the influence of such factors in ethical socialization as age and religion.

On the other hand, for several items responses were related to demographic traits that cut across the cartoonist-editor distinction. Unfortunately, the study permits little more than any tentative conclusions about the source of either cartoonists' or editors' ethical socialization.

What the study has accomplished, however, is a beginning exploration of the consequences of the two professionals' different socialization and, in particular, further insight into the cartoonist's perception of his place and purpose in the news organization.

Consider the cartoonist torn between an ethical commitment to the

integrity of his own and others' style and ideas, and what he perceives as pressure from the organization and the editor, both at the point of hiring and in consideration of individual cartoons, to copy, emulate or "clone" an Oliphant or MacNelly.

Or consider the conflict of the artist who has chosen political cartooning in order to "make a difference" on important issues and concerns of society, but who senses that those around him disapprove of his belonging to organizations or groups that pursue those ends.

Earlier studies have suggested that the editorial cartoonist travels to a different drummer. The possible editor-cartoonist conflicts that those studies suggested seem trivial compared to the implications of several of this study's findings.

The most critical editor-cartoonist conflict is not likely whether the cartoonist is seen by his editor as "critic" first and "artist" second; nor having an editor determine which of his work is seen by the public; nor being asked to submit seven cartoons weekly instead of five; nor feeling "at odds" with the newspaper's political stance; nor being permitted to test the boundaries of taste or appropriateness.

The most important conflict, and the one which may subsume all these, may be one of ethics, of different repertoires of response options. And like the journalist's, whose disengagement, disaffiliation ethic is rooted historically in the notion of an adversary purpose for the press, the political cartoonist's ethic may be rooted in his own sense of historical purpose: to use his art in the interest of his commitment.

The cartoonist does not fear attending conventions intended to influence his image of a corporate sponsor; his commitments are elsewhere, and are firm. He sees no need to avoid treating in his art those with whom he has personal conflicts; his commitments create those conflicts. And he

does not fear that belonging to interest groups will affect his work; the interests of those groups are his work.

A code of ethics? Unnecessary, for cartoonists. The single most important professional ethic for the editorial cartoonist, commitment, remains a part of the cartoonist's repertoire. It has somehow escaped being lost by too much exposure to newsroom colleagues whose personal commitments may have been subordinated to professionalism.

Notes

[1] Jay Black, Ralph D. Barney and G. Norman Van Tubergen, "Moral Development and Belief Systems of Journalists," Mass Comm Review, 6:4-16 (Fall 1979).

[2] See, for example: John C. Merrill, "Professionalization: Danger to Press Freedom and Pluralism," Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 1:56-60 (Spring/Summer 1986); or Douglas Birkhead, "News Media Ethics and the Management of Professionals," Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 1:37-46 (Spring/Summer 1986).

[3] Mencher calls ethics "journalism's latest growth industry." Melvin Mencher, "Perhaps It's Time to Examine the Sins of the Newspaper Generals," ASNE Bulletin, February 1984, pp. 16-17.

[4] Merrill, op. cit.

[5] C. David Rambo, "Codes of Ethics," presstime, February 1984, pp. 20, 21.

[6] Endres has begun to explore the role of these characteristics in journalists' ethical socialization. See: Fred F. Endres, "Influences on the Ethical Socialization of U.S. Newspaper Journalists," Newspaper Research Journal, 6:47-56 (Spring 1985).

[7] Daniel Riffe, Donald Sneed and Roger L. Van Ommeren, "Behind the Editorial Page Cartoon," Journalism Quarterly, 62:378-383, 450 (Summer 1985); "Differences Between Editorial Page Editors and Cartoonists on Six Issue Classes," Journalism Quarterly, 62:896-899 (Winter 1985); "Cartoonists and Editors Look at Cartooning," paper presented at the Annual Convention, AEJMC, Gainesville, Fla., 1984; "The Limits of Taste in Editorial Cartooning: Who or What is 'Fair Game'?", paper presented at the Southwest Symposium on Mass Communications, Lubbock, Tex., 1986; and "Deciding the Limits of Taste in Editorial Cartooning," Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1987, in press).

[8] Birkhead, op. cit. Gaye Tuchman has advanced similar arguments in her,

"Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," American Journal of Sociology, 77:660-679 (1972). And, of course, Warren Breed's seminal treatise on dysfunctions of newsroom socialization predates Tuchman and Birkhead. See, "Social Control in the Newsroom," Social Forces, 33:326-335 (May 1955).

[9] Endres, op. cit.

[10] Richard G. Gray and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, "Portrait of the U.S. Journalist," Editor & Publisher, May 21, 1983, p. 11.

[11] Endres, op. cit., p. 51.

[12] Thomas Collins, "Whose Idea Was It?" Newsday, December 10, 1985, Part II, pp. 3, 6.

[13] Many would argue that issues of appropriateness or "poor taste" (i.e. objectionable material) in political cartooning are also ethical issues. See Riffe, et al. (1986, Autumn 1987), op. cit.

[14] Editor & Publisher Yearbook: 1984 (Editor & Publisher, 1985) provided the basic list, which was amended to reflect firings, deaths and suspensions reported in Jimmy Margulies' "in transition" column in Target: The Political Cartoon Quarterly.

[15] James J. Best, "Editorial Cartoonists: A Descriptive Survey," Newspaper Research Journal, 7:29-37 (Winter 1986).

[16] Riffe, et al., (Summer 1985) op. cit.

[17] When the two samples' distributions on political party identification (Independent, Democrat, Republican and Other) were compared, chi-square was 4.11, with 3 d.f., not significant at the p=.05 level; for religious denomination (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, None), chi-square was 4.06, with 3 d.f., not significant.

[18] Cartoonist comments suggest the basis for this idea-style distinction: exaggerated squareness to Richard Nixon's nose and jawline represents

"style"; a panel showing a back view of Democratic candidates Mondale and Ferraro, hands clasped and raised to the nominating convention, with Mondale crossing the fingers of his other hand, represents an "idea."

[19] See Edwin Emery and Michael Emery, The Press and America: An Interpretive History of the Mass Media Fifth Edition (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984) pp. 215-216, 440.

[20] Rob Pudim, personal correspondence, 1985.

[21] Handelman has written that the leading political cartoonists of the 1950s saw their duty as "the tearing down and shaking up of the opposition." See Audrey Handelman, "Political Cartoonists as They Saw Themselves During the 1950s," Journalism Quarterly, 61:137-141 (Spring 1984).

[22] Jimmy Margulies, personal correspondence, 1985. See also Collins, op. cit., p. 6.

[23] Analyses were conducted on all 21 items in Table One, but results are shown only if the control variables located significant within-sample differences (see Table Two for discussion of procedures).

TABLE ONE
Differences Between Editorial Cartoonists and Editors
on Questions of Ethics

	Cartoonist mean[a] (% agree)	Editor mean (% agree)	p< dif
Styles and Copying: "special" ethical concerns			
There is nothing wrong with a cartoonist copying or emulating the style of other cartoonists.	3.77 (11)	3.71 (15)	
Editors sometimes drive cartoonists to copy the style of other cartoonists.	2.83 (49)	3.91 (12)	.00001[b]
Some cartoonists lose their originality because newspapers want cartoonists whose work emulates the most successful cartoonists.	2.36 (61)	3.32 (34)	.00001
It is wrong for cartoonists to use other cartoonists' ideas.	1.58 (83)	2.43 (56)	.00001
Newspapers and syndicates sometimes hire cartoonists because their style resembles the work of highly successful cartoonists.	1.78 (79)	2.65 (46)	.00001
"Freebies" and Conflicts of Interest			
Cartoonists should not attend conventions for their profession that are sponsored by corporate sponsors.	2.85 (39)	2.10 (66)	.0003
A cartoonist's membership in a political party sometimes affects how critical the cartoonist is of an opposing party.	2.15 (71)	2.42 (60)	
If a cartoonist has a personal (not job-related) conflict with a businessman,politician or official, the cartoonist should take special steps to avoid doing a cartoon about that person.	3.00 (46)	1.74 (84)	.00001
Cartoonists should refuse to accept "freebies" (free tickets, special rates, etc.) offered by merchants or corporations.	2.01 (70)	1.46 (89)	.00001
Cartoonists should never draw cartoons that criticize a company or an individual who advertises in the newspaper that the cartoonist works for.	4.72 (3)	4.80 (2)	
Cartoonists should not join or participate in advocacy groups or causes (environmentalist, gun ownership, etc.).	3.37 (32)	2.40 (56)	.00001
Cartoonists should not do freelance work for commercial clients.	3.80 (23)	2.69 (45)	.00001

TABLE ONE (continued)

A cartoonist should sometimes go beyond criticism and draw cartoons that help solve problems of society (drug abuse, sexual abuse of children, etc.).	1.58 (85)	1.72 (42)	
Deciding What's Ethical			
When an ethical question arises, the cartoonist alone should decide what cartoons are published.	3.41 (22)	4.68 (6)	.00001
When an ethical question arises, the editor alone should de-decide which cartoons are published.	3.76 (18)	2.46 (63)	.00001
When an ethical question arises, the cartoonist and editor working together should decide which cartoons are published.	1.57 (89)	1.93 (79)	.02
Cartoonists need a code of ethics for their profession.	3.01 (42)	2.98 (41)	
Cartoonists would never endorse a code of ethics for their profession.	2.89 (36)	3.21 (24)	
It would be helpful if one of the cartonists' proessional organizations monitored and reported on published cartoons on matters of taste and copying ideas.	3.35 (33)	3.19 (36)	
Dismissal is the best punishment for a cartoonist who violates his newspaper's "ethical standards."	3.65 (17)	3.41 (19)	
Temporary suspension is the best punishment for a cartoonist who violates his newspaper's "ethical standards."	3.06 (35)	3.20 (30)	
(approximate n =)	(117)	(93)	

[a] A five-point scale, with poles labeled "Strongly Agree" and "Strongly Disagree," was used. The lower the mean, the greater the agreement with the statement.

[b] Probability associated with between-sample mean difference, by the F-test.

TABLE TWO
Significant Between- and Within-Sample[a] Differences on Questions of Ethics, by Age, Years Experience, Political Party Identification and Religion

		Cartoonist mean[b]	p of diff.[c]	Editor mean
Styles and Copying: "special" ethical concerns				
Newspapers and syndicates sometimes hire cartoonists because their style resembles the work of highly successful cartoonists.		1.78	.00001	2.65
By Religion:	Protestant	1.67	.05	2.53[d]
	Catholic	2.11	.05	3.36[d,e]
	None	1.72		2.40[e]
"Freebies" and Conflicts of Interest				
Cartoonists should not attend conventions for their profession that are sponsored by corporate sponsors.		2.85	.0003	2.10
By Age:	< Mean age	3.06[d]	.05	2.50[d]
	> Mean age	2.47[d]	.05	1.90[d]
By Years Experience:	< Mean years	3.07[d]	.05	2.15
	> Mean years	2.50[d]		1.96
By Party:	Democrat	2.80	.05	1.76
	GOP	3.63[d]		2.64
	Independent	2.68[d]	.05	2.02
Cartoonists should never draw cartoons that criticize a company or an individual who advertises in the newspaper that the cartoonist works for.		4.72		4.80
By Party:	Democrat	4.64		4.52
	GOP	4.37[d]		4.83
	Independent	4.96[d]		4.88
Cartoonists should not join or participate in advocacy groups or causes (environmentalist, gun ownership, etc.).		3.37	.00001	2.40
By Age:	< Mean age	3.70[d]	.05	2.48
	> Mean age	2.83[d]		2.35
By Years Experience:	< Mean years	3.67[d]	.05	2.39
	> Mean years	2.96[d]		2.40

(CONTINUED)

TABLE TWO (continued)

A cartoonist should sometimes go beyond criticism and draw cartoons that help solve problems of society (drug abuse, sexual abuse of children, etc.).		1.58		1.72
By Age:	< Mean age	1.77[d]		2.07[d]
	> Mean age	1.21[d]		1.53[d]
By Years Experience:	< Mean years	1.78[d]		1.78
	> Mean years	1.27[d]		1.52
By Party:	Democrat	1.85[d]		2.10
	GOP	1.39		1.50
	Independent	1.27[d]		1.54
Deciding What's Ethical				
When an ethical question arises, the editor alone should decide which cartoons are published.		3.76	.00001	2.46
By Age:	< Mean age	4.04[d]	.05	2.32
	> Mean age	3.30[d]	.05	2.53
By Years Experience:	< Mean years	3.98[d]	.05	2.45
	> Mean years	3.45[d]	.05	2.48
Cartoonists need a code of ethics for their profession.		3.01		2.98
By Religion:	Protestant	2.79[d]		2.85
	Catholic	2.56[e]		3.45
	No Religion	4.00[d,e]	.05	2.82
Cartoonists would never endorse a code of ethics for their profession.		2.89		3.21
By Party:	Democrats	3.05		3.56[d]
	GOP	2.84	.05	4.18[e]
	Independents	2.89		2.80[d,e]
	(approximate n =)	(117)		(93)

[a] Partial analyses were conducted on all items in Table One; however, only those items for which the control variables (religion, party, age and experience) produced significant within-sample differences are shown.

[b] A five-point scale, with poles labeled "Strongly Agree" and "Strongly Disagree," was used. The lower the mean, the greater the agreement with the statement.

[c] The overall difference between sample means (underlined) are based on F-tests, as noted and shown in Table One. Between-sub-sample differences (e.g., Catholic cartoonists vs. Catholic editors) are based on t-tests for independent samples.

[d,e] For each subanalysis, common superscripts denote significant

differences within the sample based, first, on a significant F in a one way analysis of variance and, second, on a least significant differences post hoc test (alpha = .05). Thus, for the first item, Catholic editors differed significantly from Protestant editors and editors claiming "no religion."